

Indiana State Sentinel.

SEMI-WEEKLY.
ETERNAL VIOLENCE IS THE PRICE OF LIBERTY.
INDIANAPOLIS, AUGUST 15, 1846.

Our Terms.
The following will be the permanent terms of the *Indiana State Sentinel*:
(1) Payments to be made always in advance.
One copy, one year, \$2.00
Three copies, one year, 5.00
Five copies, one year, 8.00
Ten copies, one year, 15.00
Twenty copies, one year, directed to one person, 20.00
Semi-Weekly.
(Published three times a week during the session.)
One copy, \$1.00 Three copies, \$3.00

Our article of the 8th, demonstrating the treason of the Royal Family to the Democratic party, has raised up some of its able members, who fill the columns of the last number of the *Organ* with a sort of *alla polidra* assault upon us. The greatest beauties of these last efforts of the gang are, that, adroitly endeavoring to change the issues which we made against them of printing spurious tickets, and otherwise operating against the Democratic party at the recent election,—they make sundry false charges against us, and then, with characteristic effrontery, say they expect we shall pronounce their statements false! Well, we shall of course do nothing else. They talked a week ago of proving and showing the truth of other charges which they made to offset their own notorious treachery. We dared them to produce their pretended proof, and lo! it appears only in the shape of a new accumulation of falsehood. This may be gratifying enough to the Whig patrons of the *Organ*, and possibly to the lickspittles of no politics among their supporters; but it will hardly satisfy those men of principle, who are something better than mere political gamblers.

We shall not fill our editorial columns with even replies to the base gang of pirates under the command of the Royal Family, but as leisure and space permits we shall take care that the people are made acquainted with their movements and designs.

KILLED BY LIGHTNING.—On Thursday, at about two o'clock, p. m., during a thunder squall which came up suddenly, THOMAS RAMSEY, was struck instantly dead by lightning near the corner of Indiana and Vermont streets. He was a carpenter by trade, and was on his way from dinner, where his wife and children had just parted with him. Little did they dream, when he left them, full of health, that he would thus suddenly and without warning be summoned into eternity. In the aid and sympathy of the benevolent may they find comfort and consolation.

Dr. Gaston, one of the physicians who was called, states to us that the lightning seemed to have first struck the deceased upon the upper front of the head a little to the left; passing down, it singed off the hair of the left eye-brow, continued its course down the body, tearing the skin a little upon the lower part of the abdomen, and then passed down the legs to the ground. There were two holes in the earth, indicating that the deceased was in the act of walking rapidly or running.

We understand that the body was carried home, and that it was three quarters of an hour before physicians could be procured to attend. But in all probability they could have done no good even at the earliest moment. In such cases, we believe it is the received opinion that the best remedial means is the profuse and sudden application of cold water to the head and chest, and friction of the limbs. This can be done by any person.

Reasons.—There are plenty of them. We find the following in a letter from Washington:

A British bearer of despatches for Mexico came over in the same steamer with Gen. Armstrong. It is stated that the British Government have directed their Minister at Mexico, through this bearer of despatches, to advise the Mexican Government to make peace with the United States as speedily as possible, for England, in this matter, can render no aid to Mexico.

There is a rumor afloat that a Commissioner for Mexico has arrived here, bringing an offer from his government to cede to Mexico all territory west of the Rocky Mountains, and ready access to honorable terms of peace.

It is also rumored that Mr. Polk has submitted to the Senate that he will send Mr. Sidel as minister to Mexico, if the Senate should think it prudent to do so, and that he will ask of Congress an appropriation of \$3,000,000 for the purchase of some of the western States or Departments of the Mexican Republic.

The Philadelphia Spirit of the Times has been one of the most violent assailants of the New Tariff, and of Mr. Dallas. It seems that the writer of those articles is the infamous *Johnson*, notorious for the alleged seduction of Mrs. Potterfield, and the murder of her husband at Nashville a few months ago. He is a fit instrument of the High Tariffists!

DEATH OF ANOTHER DEMOCRATIC EDITOR.—The New Hampshire Patriot of the 6th, brings the melancholy intelligence of the death of its Editor, HENRY H. CARROLL, Esq. He died on the 4th, after an illness of a few hours, of a disease of the brain. He was one of the ablest editors of the Union, and his death will be universally deplored.

The extent of the Louisville Journal's information, as to Indiana politics, may be seen in the following: "Only one-half the Senators are elected each year, and owing to the large locofoco majority of the Senators holding over, they will probably retain the ascendancy in that body."

This, of course, is indicative of "all the intelligence." A Good Toast.—Judge Wick was invited to attend a public dinner at Philadelphia, on the 4th of July. He could not go, but sent the following toast, which was applicable and well put:

The *Keystone State*.—When all her sons shall emancipate themselves from the thralldom of that exploded notion—that taxation is Protection—and learn not to legislate for classes, she will better her claim to her ancient title of *Commonwealth*.

It costs the government twenty-five cents per pound for pork destined for the use of the army. If this is not "going the whole hog," we admit our ignorance of what constitutes that agreeable occupation.—*Ohio Statesman*.

Well: Commissioners, suitors, &c., must have some means of making money and getting rich, and perhaps they may as well do so by charging the government twenty-five cents a pound for pork, as by staying at home and gambling it out of somebody else.

THE PANIC.—A writer in the Troy Budget denies the statement that some 200, or that any hands had been discharged in the Troy Vulcan Works. He adds, that several large concerns in that city, who employ more men than any of the Iron Works, and some of them as many persons as any of the Cotton or Woollen factories, will not discharge a single person in consequence of the passage of McKay's tariff bill.

We invite attention to the notice, in another column, of Miss AKEL, the Principal of the Indianapolis Female Institute.

The *Nativists* have again carried the city of St. Louis. Disgraceful enough!

Congress.

On the 8th, the Senate proceeded to ballot for a President *pro tem*, the Vice-President having announced that he should be absent the remainder of the session. On the 8th ballot Mr. Acheson was chosen. Mr. Hannegan was a candidate during the first five balloting, and received on the fourth 23 votes. After the fifth, he withdrew his name.

The following message from the President was sent to both Houses:

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States:

I invite your attention to the propriety of making an appropriation to provide for any expenditure which it may be necessary to make in advance for the purpose of settling all our difficulties with the Mexican Republic. It is my sincere desire to terminate, as it was originally to avoid, the existing war with Mexico by a peace just and honorable to both parties. It is probable that the chief obstacle to be surmounted in accomplishing this desirable object, will be the adjustment of a boundary between the two Republics, which shall prove satisfactory and convenient to both, and such as neither will hereafter be inclined to dispute. The adjustment of this boundary, which ought to pay a fair equivalent for any concessions which may be made by Mexico.

Under these circumstances, and considering the other complicated questions to be settled by negotiation with the Mexican Republic, I deem it important that a sum of money should be placed under the control of the Executive, to be advanced, if need be, to the government of that Republic immediately after the ratification of a treaty. It might be inconvenient for the Mexican government to wait for the whole sum, the payment of which may be stipulated by this treaty, until it could be ratified by our Senate and an appropriation made to carry it into effect made by Congress. Indeed, the necessity for this delay might defeat the object altogether. The disbursement of this money would of course be accounted for not as secret service money, but as other expenditures.

Two precedents for such a proceeding exist in our past history. The administration of Mr. Jefferson, in which I would call your attention. On the 26th February, 1803, an act was passed appropriating two millions of dollars "for the purpose of defraying any extraordinary expenses which may be incurred in the intercourse between the United States and foreign nations." "To be applied under the direction of the President of the United States, who shall cause an account of the expenditure thereof to be laid before Congress as soon as may be;" and on the 8th of February, 1806, an appropriation was made of the same amount, and in the same terms. In neither case was the money actually drawn from the treasury, and I should hope that the result in this respect might be similar on the present occasion, although the appropriation may prove to be indispensable in accomplishing the object. I would therefore recommend the passage of a law appropriating \$2,000,000 to be placed at the disposal of the Executive, for the purpose I have indicated.

In order to prevent all misapprehension, it is my duty to state that, anxious as I am to terminate the existing war with the least possible delay, it will continue to be prosecuted with the utmost vigor until a treaty of peace shall be signed by the parties and ratified by the Mexican Republic.

JAMES K. POLK.
Washington, 8th August, 1846.

In the Senate the message was referred to the committee on finance. In the House Mr. McKay offered the following bill:

AN ACT making further provision for the expenses attending the intercourse between the United States and foreign nations.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That a sum of \$2,000,000, in addition to the provision heretofore made, be and the same is hereby appropriated for the purpose of defraying any extraordinary expenses which may be incurred in the intercourse between the United States and foreign nations, to be paid out of money in the treasury not otherwise appropriated, and to be applied under the direction of the President of the United States, who shall cause an account of the expenditure thereof to be laid before Congress as soon as may be.

The House went into committee to consider the message and bill, and after some debate, the committee rose. After spending some hours in disputing about points of order, the House again agreed to consider the bill in committee, for the space of two hours, commencing at five o'clock. This is as far as we have the proceedings.

The bill for the establishment of a territorial government in Oregon, passed the House on the 6th inst. An amendment providing that neither slavery nor involuntary servitude shall ever exist in the said territory, except for crime whereof the party shall have been convicted, was adopted by a vote of 108 to 43. The amendment of Mr. WINTHROP, granting a township of land in the Oregon territory to Martha Gray, widow of Captain Gray, the acknowledged discoverer of the Columbia river, was rejected—77 to 73.

Miami Lands.

The following is the bill granting pre-emption to Miami Lands, which passed both houses of Congress, and doubtless received the President's signature:

A BILL to grant the right of pre-emption to actual settlers on the lands acquired by treaty from the Miami Indians in Indiana.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That every actual settler, being the head of a family, or widow or single man over the age of twenty-one years, who is in possession, by actual residence as a house-keeper, of any tract of public land within the limits of the several sessions by the Miami Indians in Indiana, which have not yet been proclaimed for sale by the President, or any such person who shall hereafter sell, erect a dwelling-house, and become a house-keeper upon any such tract of land, shall be entitled to the same benefits and privileges, with respect to said land as was granted to settlers on other land by the act approved twenty-second of June 1838, entitled, "An act to grant pre-emption rights," and the several amendatory provisions of said act, effected by the subsequent acts bearing date the 19th of July, 1840, and the 1st of March, 1843. Provided, That the minimum price per acre of said land shall be two dollars per acre.

Sec. 2. And be it further enacted, That in every case the affidavit of the claimant under this act shall be like unto that prescribed by the act of twenty-second June, 1838; and the same shall be filed, and proof and payment made for the land claimed, at any time before the day fixed by the President's proclamation for the public sale of the said land. Provided, That where a tract of land is now settled upon a settlement made on such tract subsequent to the date of this law shall confer no right on the last mentioned settler; and where settlements shall hereafter be made the right shall be in the first settler, who shall otherwise comply with the conditions of this law.

GEN. GAINES.—Gen. Gaines read his defence before the Court, reviewing his conduct after the manner of Demosthenes. He concluded as follows: "Though old and grey in the service of my country, I have been advertised in the newspapers—in one called the *Union*. I have been stigmatized as an offender—and as a matter of course, advertised in the Federal *Union*. By them I have been accused as a violator of the laws of my country. For you, my old brother soldiers, it is to say, whether these things are true or false. Whether or no I am to be arraigned before a General Court Martial, or to be returned to my command. If the latter, I shall be grateful—but if your sense of propriety will not allow you thus to deal with me—and you decide that I am to be arraigned, I sincerely trust that upon the banks of the Rio Grande, where the witnesses all are now actively engaged in defence of our common country's liberties, said General Court Martial may be convened."

A WESTERN BOY'S IDEA OF MANHOOD.—An Indianapolis correspondent of the New York Tribune, relates the following dialogue held with a Hoosier boy: "I met a boy, apparently about twelve years old, and hailed him with, 'My little man, wouldn't you like to go to Texas?'" "I am going," said he. "Why, what are you going to do?" "I am going to be a pilot boy, and wait upon the officers and help cook."

"You are going to carry a gun?" "No, but I shall carry a pistol, and want to kill one Mexican, and if I get a chance, I will." "Does your mother know you are going?" "Yes, sir; and she told me to go. She wanted me to see the world, and it might make a man of me; and after one year I shall carry a musket, and if I can only kill fifteen Mexicans, I shall come back a man."

Whose boy is he?

Another Vindication of Geo. M. Dallas.

Mr. Dallas, in a letter addressed to a committee of Philadelphia gentlemen, who congratulated him on his casting vote, thus discourses. The sentiments of the letter are of the noblest character, and most happily expressed:

WASHINGTON, August 1, 1846.

Gentlemen—Your letter dated the 29th July, numerous signed by my neighbors and friends, is entitled to the expression of my grateful acknowledgments.

The casting vote given by the Vice President, in the Senate of the United States, on the 27th of July, in favor of the act of Congress to reduce the duties on imports, and of which you speak in terms of warm approbation, was a simple and unavoidable act of official duty. Every principle of public conduct upon which I have ever acted, every moral dictate of a calmly consulted conscience, and every view my mind could take of the best and broadest interests of my whole country, as they were to be affected by the question submitted for decision, demanded that vote. Not to have been called upon to give it would have gratified me; but when exacted by the constitution, in the office whose functions were assigned to me by the American people, to have conscientiously hesitated before the statement and patriots in whose presence I stood, or anywhere, would have been a sort of self-debasement and degradation to which no earthly consideration could allure me. I gave that vote, because not to have given it, would wound my conscience, wound my self-respect, wound my principles, and incurably wound my country. I claim no praise for it; the fact that it had an appearance of unkindness towards many of the community among whom I was born and have long toiled, made it painful; but it belonged to the place, was evoked by circumstances, and became inevitable.

It was inevitable, if for no other reason, because I had openly, in the face and to the knowledge of the whole country, at the moment I consented to be a candidate for the Vice Presidency, promised it to the friends of the tariff. As good faith, I had assented to the conditions or instructions of the canvass of 1844—assented in writing—and that assent has been disseminated wherever the democratic press could penetrate. I did so more than once; and having done so, scrupulously and rigorously abstained from participating in the election. On no public occasion did it become necessary or proper for me to allude to the subject of a tariff. The President's candidate, Mr. Polk, in his letter to our townsmen, Mr. Kane, very properly took his own particular course. I had no course to take about it, having given a comprehensive pledge to abide by the sense of a majority, and the matter of a tariff being expressly and emphatically involved in the binding resolutions of those who, without the slightest knowledge, or expectation, or desire on my part, proffered their votes in my favor. As good faith, I had in public men cannot be dispensed with, and is not to be evaded by sophistries, the people, as well south as north, west as east, having taken me at my word and elected me, I have fulfilled the pledge. I should have felt covered with dishonor as with a garment, had I done otherwise.

The two interests of Pennsylvania, about which much anxiety was manifested, the iron and coal interests, will not, I sincerely hope and believe, experience the injuries foretold. But, it is possible that our uprightness commonwealth can for one moment demand that an officer, elected by the suffrages of the people of all the twenty-eight States, and bound by his oath and every constitutional obligation faithfully and fairly to represent, in the execution of his high trust, all the citizens of the United States, should narrow his great sphere and act with reference only to the peculiar wishes? To inculcate such a doctrine to Pennsylvania is something more than useless; it is derogatory to her. The pages of her history are crowded with proofs that she perfectly understands the Federal Constitution, from which and through which she claims to derive no benefit which she is not willing to share equally with any member of the Union. To bind or fetter her, as she would do to her special will, in order to subvert exclusively her special will and her local policy, would manifest, in my humble judgment, a degeneracy of sentiment to which Pennsylvania, never has descended and never can descend.

It is but justice to the feelings of some of you, and of many much esteemed neighbors and political opponents to say, without claiming for it the slightest merit, that in the powerless position prescribed by the Constitution to the Vice President, as regards matters of legislation, I omitted no effort which personal intercourse and conversation enabled me to make, with a view to bring about such changes and modifications in the bill, as would comply with the wishes of the people of the whole country, and soften its apparent rigors. These efforts failed—failed from causes over which I had no control, and of which I have no right to complain; and having failed, it would be useless, if not wrong, to detail them. They are adverted to only as an assurance that, personally, I would do any thing honorable and fair to shield a friend or associate from unnecessary harm, while, officially, I must and will do my duty with undiminished inflexibility.

It is not my desire in this letter of acknowledgment, to vindicate the new and enlarged system of commercial intercourse which the American people have determined to enter upon. Towards that system, however, no observing man can avoid seeing that all Christendom, as if by simultaneous impulse, is rapidly tending. It is the spirit of expanding Liberty and prolonged Peace; and I feel such unwavering confidence in the enterprise, spirit, hardihood, and perseverance of my countrymen, that I cannot doubt, however severe the sacrifice involved in a beginning may be, that the end of a generous and universal competition must be their triumph over all the rest of the world.

I am, truly and respectfully,

Your fellow citizen and friend,
G. M. DALLAS.

To Athanasius Ford, George Guier, Richard Pelz, John Heintz, Wm. W. Weeks, Esquires, and others, Philadelphia.

The New York Journal of Commerce pays the following well merited tribute to the Vice-President of the United States:

"If I ever coveted any man's position, it was that of GEO. M. DALLAS, when upon him alone devolved the responsibility of passing or defeating the People's Tariff. He however proved himself equal to the emergency; and although he has since been burned in effigy by some of the indiscreet friends of the Tariff of 1842, yet we do not hesitate to say that the vote which he gave on the memorable 28th of July, relieving the millions from burdens to which they have so long been subjected for the benefit of a comparatively few, will prove to be, with the nation at large, the most popular act of his life. We believe it was an act of principle and duty, against a combination of influences sufficient to have crushed any ordinary man."

BURNING IN EFFIGY.—We recommend the following, from a Pennsylvania paper, to the careful perusal of violent protectionists. It is remarkably pointed, we think, and "speaks for itself."

"The streets of Philadelphia that were by a Federal mob. During the Bank panic, the Federalists, who composed this mob, and calling themselves National Republicans, burned the effigy of General Andrew Jackson on the same ground. In 1797, the effigy of Thomas Jefferson was burned on the same identical spot by the grandfathers of the rioters of 1846, who at that time called themselves Federalists. In 1775-8-7-2-9, the great-grandfathers of this same mob of 1846 burned the effigy of Patrick Henry and George Washington, on the same spot likewise, and went by the name of Tories. The line of descent is so direct as to be unquestionable; and what is more remarkable is, that the old generation always manage it to become so unpopular that they advise their children to change their names."

TERRIBLE HURRICANE.—A terrific hurricane occurred at the Island of Rarotoga, on the 16th of March. The sea overflowed its banks and the rain descended in torrents. Two hundred and twenty dwelling houses were swept away. Thousands of coconut, breadfruit and other trees ripped up by the roots, and the work of twenty years of civilization entirely destroyed. No lives were lost, but a severe famine was anticipated.

The Navigation of the Columbia.

A difference of opinion prevails to a very great extent, both in this country and in England, as to the construction of that section of the Oregon treaty, giving to the Hudson's Bay Company the free navigation of the Columbia river,—some maintaining the grant to be perpetual, and others that it is limited to the duration of the Company's present charter. The language of the treaty is certainly ambiguous; but it seems to us that the position assumed by the Philadelphia Ledger, in the following article, is the correct one.

The newspapers, American and British, are at war about the extent of the rights granted by the Oregon treaty, to British subjects in the navigation of the Columbia river. A leading "Whig" journal of New York has twice said that the grant is perpetual to all British subjects. Some lawyers of Washington, upon examination of the charter to the Hudson's Bay Company, reach the same conclusion. The British journals, without having seen the treaty, and doubtless without instruction from any body competent to enlighten them, take the same ground. Of course, the British journalists would be gratified that all the advantages of the treaty were secured to their own country, and withheld from ours. But we must not forget that in a country where cabinet secrets are much more carefully kept, even than in ours, journalists are less authentic even, than our letter-writers; and how very accurate they are, the well-informed and reflecting can judge! But while expecting all this in British journals, we are amused at the alacrity with which certain American journals jump at the British side of any question. The patriotic souls are always in distress at the thought of justice to their own country.

The second article of the treaty is plain enough. It grants the navigation of the Columbia "to the Hudson's Bay Company, and to all British subjects trading with the same." After defining the geographical extent of the navigation thus granted, the same article of the treaty says, in the same connection, "in navigating the said river or rivers, British subjects with their goods and produce, shall be treated on the same footing as citizens of the United States." Then follows, and in the same sentence, the exclusive right of the United States to regulate the navigation of the river or rivers, not inconsistently with this treaty. Here then are two parties, the United States on one side, and the Hudson's Bay Company and British subjects trading with them, on the other; and the navigation of a river is the thing granted by the first party, and to the second; and while the first party has the sole right of prescribing the modes of this navigation, the second has the same right in it under these modes, with the first. The first question presented is, who are the second party? The Hudson's Bay Company received a charter in 1828, limited to twenty-one years, and therefore will cease to exist under this charter in 1859. Therefore the obvious limitation of the grant to the Company is the term of years of its charter.

But we are told that the charter may be renewed, and the new charter may be perpetual; and that if it should be, the grant would be perpetual. In treaties between sovereign States, all grants are construed strictly against the grantee; and in municipal law, all grants expire with the life of the grantee, unless their terms expressly prolong them to successors. Thus a grant of lands to A. in fee, without the words "heirs and assigns," is a grant for his life, or to a corporation without the word successors, is limited to the duration of the charter under which it existed as a corporation when the grant was made. The grant under this treaty is made to the Hudson's Bay Company as it now exists, and to that only. It is a distinct, specific corporation, of limited duration; and with a direct view to that limitation must the word be construed, no word of prolongation, or successor, or perpetuity being used. The grant is to the Hudson's Bay Company, and not to any other company, not yet existing. In 1859, this Hudson's Bay Company ceases to exist. Upon whom then does the grant operate? Nobody is alive to receive it, and consequently it reverts to the grantor. But we shall be told that the Company's life is prolonged by a new charter. We answer, a new life is not thereby proffered, but that a new life is given to it, or more properly that life is given to a new thing. The new charter creates a new company and therefore considers the old one as if it never had existed. This new charter, so far as the rights of a sovereign State, a nation, are concerned, has no connection with, and therefore cannot operate upon the past. It can operate only upon the future, that future which begins with its date. The navigation of the Columbia river, granted by this treaty, is now a thing of the past to this new charter. It did with the old charter. Hence this new charter could no more reach this old grant, than it could any of the privileges, long since extinct, granted by the Old South Sea Company, or than a Railroad Corporation from Boston to Plymouth, could revive the old privileges of the old Massachusetts Bay Company. The old Hudson's Bay Company of 1828 will have served its purpose and be dead, in 1859, and the new Hudson's Bay Company, if any such shall then or afterwards be created, will be quite another thing, with a prospective, but no retrospective operation.

But all the unexpired contracts with the old company will inure to the new. This is true, so far as it covers contracts between the Hudson's Bay Company, which is one British subject, and any other British subjects; for the nation never dies, and its laws for public convenience, continue over all its subjects till repealed. But the United States are not a British subject, but a nation; and a grant by them to the British nation, for the benefit of a particular British subject, of limited duration, cannot be prolonged by the British nation alone, without the concurrence of the United States, for the benefit of their British subject. The United States have made a grant to the Hudson's Bay Company of 1828, dying in 1859, or more properly to the British nation for the use of this company; and the British nation alone cannot extend that grant to another person, the Hudson's Bay Company of 1860. If it could, it might, by parity of argument, extend the grant to the East India Company or the Bank of England; for no greater power is necessary to transfer it from the grantee named, to one new person or person not named, than another.

But the grant extends to British subjects; and they not being specified, the grant is perpetual to all British subjects." But the British subjects who are grantees are specified, and they are subjects trading with the Hudson's Bay Company, and no others; and the Company dies in 1859, no British subjects can afterwards trade with it, and the grant is a dead letter, trading then with the ancient Romans, and content for the free and perpetual navigation of the Styx.

A London paper sneers at Mr. CORDEN, the anti-corn-law leader, thus:

"And who is Mr. Corden, and what has he done? He is the son of a Sussex farmer, who preferred the trade of a calico printer. Succeeding in this business, his ambition led him to seek a seat in Parliament. He therefore threw himself into the corn-law agitation, and has succeeded in his aim."

This is absolutely the handsomest compliment which it is possible to pay the Great Reformer. The wise as well as witty London *Punch*, after descending at length upon the above extract, gives the annexed forcible finishing stroke:

"And still as Corden spoke, and as the League was dissolved, the fact—his grand end gloriously, because peacefully, accomplished—sure we are that every corn field waved more beautifully beneath the all-encircling heavens, whose impartial bounty shed upon all men, should teach all that they are all of one family—created to assist, esteem, and live in peace with one another. And this glorious lesson (never to be taught by schoolmasters, with their hands on their shoulders) will ultimately be taught by Free Trade. Such were the thoughts—such the belief that the last oration of Richard Cobden awakened in us, listening."

And now we learn that "He is the son of a Sussex farmer, who preferred the trade of a calico printer." We feel that we have been grossly insulted.

REFORMING BISHOPS.—The only occupants of the bench of Bishops who supported the repeal of the Corn-Laws, were the Bishop of Oxford, Dr. Wilberforce, the son of him who has made that name illustrious, and the Bishop of St. David's, Dr. Thirlwall, the celebrated author of the best history of Greece, extant. It is satisfactory to know that the only two of that Right Reverend body who have done anything to make their existence known to their contemporary posterity in America, were found in favor of the repeal of Class Licency, and the legal practical righteousness of helping the hungry to bread.

Mexican Declaration.

We copy below the recent Declaration of the Mexican Congress in relation to the United States. The reader will be struck with the resemblance it bears to the positions generally assumed by the Whig press in this country. In fact it is a summary of the Whig pretences in favor of Mexico and against our own country; and we should suppose was gathered directly from some of our leading Whig papers:

The Extraordinary National Congress of the Mexican Republic considering:
That the Republic of the United States of America, with the notorious violation of all right, has instigated and protected openly and perseveringly the insurrection of the colonists of Texas against the nation which had admitted them upon its territory, and generously shielded them with the protection of its laws:

That it has incorporated the same territory of Texas into its Union by an act of its Congress, notwithstanding it has always belonged by undisputed right to the Mexican nation, has been recognized as such, by the United States themselves, as appears by the boundary treaties of 1823 and 1835:

That it has not maintained the solemn assurances and reservations in regard to the right of the Mexican Republic, by means of its agents, it had made in conformity with those treaties:

That it has also invaded the Department of Tamaulipas, introducing an army upon the left bank of the Rio Bravo, giving occasion and origin to the battles of the 8th and 9th of May of the present year:

That in time of profound peace, and during established relations of amity between the two countries, it has invaded by land and sea the territories of the Californias:

That it has blockaded the ports of Matamoros, Vera Cruz, and Tampico, of Tamaulipas, opening its fire upon the defenses of the latter:

That it has authorized a levy of troops against Mexico:

That it has declared war against the Republic, under the pretext that the said States had been invaded, when in fact they made the first invasion:

And lastly considering that the nationality of the Mexicans is seriously compromised by the power and spirit of usurpation, flagrantly manifested by the neighboring nation of the United States—DECREES.

First—The Mexican nation, in the exercise of its natural defence, is actually in a state of war with the United States of America.

Second—In consequence thereof, the government employ all its resources and powers to render the war effectual to the reparation of injury done to the Mexican nation: it will complete the bodies of permanent militia, and levy new troops at once to the extent it shall deem necessary, both to fill up the bodies at present on foot, and to create others of the same description; and if it shall need other special powers, Congress will confer them.

THE OREGON QUESTION.—The London Morning Chronicle, after speaking of the blessings of peace at the present juncture, proceeds as follows:

"All this is favorable. Nevertheless the plain truth that, in respect to the details of the negotiation, England has been over-reached, must not be concealed from us. A grant of lands to A. in fee, without the words 'heirs and assigns,' is a grant for his life, or to a corporation without the word successors, is limited to the duration of the charter under which it existed as a corporation when the grant was made. The grant under this treaty is made to the Hudson's Bay Company as it now exists, and to that only. It is a distinct, specific corporation, of limited duration; and with a direct view to that limitation must the word be construed, no word of prolongation, or successor, or perpetuity being used. The grant is to the Hudson's Bay Company, and not to any other company, not yet existing. In 1859, this Hudson's Bay Company ceases to exist. Upon whom then does the grant operate? Nobody is alive to receive it, and consequently it reverts to the grantor. But we shall be told that the Company's life is prolonged by a new charter. We answer, a new life is not thereby proffered, but that a new life is given to it, or more properly that life is given to a new thing. The new charter creates a new company and therefore considers the old one as if it never had existed. This new charter, so far as the rights of a sovereign State, a nation, are concerned, has no connection with, and therefore cannot operate upon the past. It can operate only upon the future, that future which begins with its date. The navigation of the Columbia river, granted by this treaty, is now a thing of the past to this new charter. It did with the old charter. Hence this new charter could no more reach this old grant, than it could any of the privileges, long since extinct, granted by the Old South Sea Company, or than a Railroad Corporation from Boston to Plymouth, could revive the old privileges of the old Massachusetts Bay Company. The old Hudson's Bay Company of 1828 will have served its purpose and be dead, in 1859, and the new Hudson's Bay Company, if any such shall then or afterwards be created, will be quite another thing, with a prospective, but no retrospective operation."

The *New York Tribune*—the leading British paper on this continent—does not like the Oregon treaty it appears. The following extract is a very forcible commentary upon the effort made in certain quarters to show that the Administration, in settling the question, has compromised our rights, and yielded the best portion of the territory.

"All that has been done for that vast country has been done by England. British enterprise and treasure have made it what it is, and it is now handed over—the most valuable part, to the United States, without an equivalent, save that of peace. To avert the calamities of the future, the Government has given up a territory of prodigious extent and inestimable value, retaining only a small interest for a few of its subjects, who could not be lawfully dispossessed of it. Surely the right of way to this small fragment of a nation calling itself just and magnanimous."

The settlement of the question has given universal delight and satisfaction throughout England, notwithstanding the disadvantage of the terms, and notwithstanding that the settlement has been made at the expense of the peace of the world, or to lessen the value of the peace the treaty has secured. All persons look forward to a long period of peace and prosperity trade between the two countries. Even the belligerent Lord Palmerston has expressed himself satisfied."

AN INDIAN MOTHER.—A correspondent of the Journal of Commerce relates the following incident which occurred during a visit made by him to the Indians now at Washington:

"Among those who were introduced into the room at our visit, was a squaw, whose physiognomy might be said to resemble that of a short, stubby Irish girl, such as is frequently seen at the wash-tub. Without any pretensions to beauty, there was a certain frankness and good nature in her countenance, which secured her a favorable impression. Her thick, lank hair hung in full length down her face, reaching almost to her shoulders, while a slight tinge of paint set off her copper cheek to special advantage. She was the wife of one of the chiefs. My little girl stood clinging to my hand, as she ventured to look up timidly at this Indian—namely I believe, a Seneca—children,—her fears not being diminished by the fact that some half dozen savages of the forest were walking about the room, some evidently not in a very pleasant mood of mind. For some time this squaw eyed my child with singular earnestness, seeming indeed to forget all around in the interest which the little girl had created in her feelings. She continued to gaze on her till the tear was seen to start in her eyes. Presently she clasped her in her arms, raised her up, and for some moments held the trembling child to her bosom in the most affectionate manner; then having placed her on her feet and let her go, continued to follow her round the room until we departed. When we inquired what it could mean, the interpreter replied, that she had left a little girl of the same age at home. That was the solution of the matter. There was the beating of the savage mother's heart, with a pulsation that had its origin in the pangs of the West. The delicate, invisible chord that bound the heart of the mother to the child, stretched far across the Alleghenies, and the "father of rivers," to those forest solitudes where the savages delight to roam, and where the natural affection, planted by God in the undisturbed bosom, glows with its native ardor, and is regulated by the same laws that are seen to be developed in a civilized life."

THE SCRIPTURE ARGUMENT.—Fletcher Webster, Esq., in his Fourth of July Oration, says—"The Scriptures nowhere denounce war in terms, they attack no classes, no professions, no occupations of men." This argument is worthy of Jonathan Wild, who justified himself in drinking punch, on the ground that it was a liquor no where spoken evil of in the Scriptures."

General Cass offered a resolution in the Senate, on the 7th, for the publication of the charter and other acts of the Hudson's Bay Company. His object was that the people might see that the free navigation of the Columbia was granted to Great Britain in perpetuity, by the treaty.